

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY BY APPLICANT**

At the outset, the Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview conducted January 10, 2007. During the interview, the Applicant's representative presented the following arguments for patentability. The Examiner acknowledges that *Janning et al* does not teach the technique for determining whether a vehicle is stationary as recited in the present claims. Instead, she applies *Bashan et al* for that purpose. However, the Applicant does not believe that *Bashan et al* overcomes the noted deficiency of *Janning et al*. *Bashan et al* teaches a system for monitoring parked vehicles in which RFID parking cards and readers replace traditional parking meters. The system does not check to see whether a vehicle is stationary. Instead, a parked vehicle is presupposed to be stationary; the system checks to see whether the parking card has enough credit to pay for parking and whether a time limit for parking where the vehicle is parked has been exceeded.

The Examiner said that she better understood the Applicant's position and that in the response, the Applicant should include in the remarks the arguments set forth during the interview, particularly the difference between the system of the present claimed invention and the parking system of *Bashan et al*.

The Examiner also proposed amending the claims to recite that the timer is in the vehicle presence detector. The purpose of the amendment would be to differentiate the invention from the parking system of *Bashan et al*, in which the timer is located in the parking tag 11.

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed September 6, 2006, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,446,049 to *Janning et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,339,000 (*Bashan et al.*) Claim 4 is rejected over those two references and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,241 to *Kohut et al.* Claim 8 is rejected over those two references and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,871 to *Terranova*. For the reasons set forth below, the Applicant respectfully traverses all of those grounds of rejection.

According to the present claimed invention, the stationary vehicle is detected by (i) setting a timer, (ii) detecting the vehicle, (iii) determining whether the timer has been exceeded when the vehicle is detected, and (iv) if the timer has been exceeded, determining that the vehicle is stationary. None of the applied combinations of references would have resulted in the present claimed invention having such features.

It is acknowledged that *Janning et al.* does not teach the technique for determining whether a vehicle is stationary as recited in the present claims. Instead, *Bashan et al.* is applied for that purpose. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Bashan et al.* does not overcome the noted deficiency of *Janning et al.* *Bashan et al.* teaches a system for monitoring parked vehicles in which RFID parking cards and readers replace traditional parking meters. The system does not check to see whether a vehicle is stationary. Instead, a parked vehicle is presupposed to be stationary; the system checks to see whether the parking card has enough credit to pay for parking and whether a time limit for parking where the

vehicle is parked has been exceeded. Thus, none of the proposed combinations of references would have taught or suggested the present claimed invention.

In addition, claims 14 and 15 have been added to recite that the timer is in the vehicle presence detector. The purpose of the new claims is to differentiate the invention even further from the parking system of *Bashan et al*, in which the timer is located in the parking tag 11. The subject matter of the new claims is supported by the originally filed disclosure, e.g., in the first paragraph of page 10.

However, the Applicant has declined the Examiner's invitation to add that limitation to the independent claims at this time, but instead has opted to add dependent claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If there remain any issues that can be overcome through a further telephone communication, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Please charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (114944-00106). If an extension of time is required to render this Amendment timely and either is not filed concurrently herewith or is insufficient to render this Amendment timely, the Applicant hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for such an extension for as many months as are required to render this Amendment timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David J. Edmondson', written over a horizontal line.

By: David J. Edmondson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,126

Blank Rome LLP  
Watergate 600, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
600 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-2485  
202-772-5800 (telephone)  
202-772-5838 (direct dial to attorney signing paper)  
202-572-1438 (facsimile)